

Remarks

Claims 1-15 were submitted for examination. In this Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6 and 8-14 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kolster (US Patent No.: 5,920,877, hereafter "Kolster"), and Claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolster in view of Yokota (US Pat. 6,334,003, hereafter "Yokota").

The Examiner is thanked for the thoughtful review of the application. In the foregoing amendments, the Applicants have cancelled Claim 8, amended Claims 1 and 9 to further distinguish from the cited references. As a result of the amendments, Claims 1-7 and 9-15 are still pending. Reconsideration of these pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and these remarks.

As amended, Claim 1 now recites:

a portable computing device;
a scanner integrated with the portable computing device as a single portable device with scanning capability, the scanner exposing to a scanning object and generating an image thereof when the portable computing device and the scanning object have a relative motion; and
wherein the portable computing device includes an optical recognition engine that receives the image and produces texts therefrom.

(emphasis added)

As shown in FIG. 2A or FIG. 2B of the pending application, Claim 1 recites a single portable device integrating a portable computing device and a scanner. FIG. 2A or FIG. 2B also shows that a business card being scanned by the scanner that is indeed a part of the integrated device.

In contrast, FIG. 1 of Kolster shows that a computing device 11 is attached with a scanner device 12. Evidently, *the computing device 11 and the scanner device 12 do not make "a single portable device"*. In fact, the scanner device 12 is not even a part of "a single portable device". The Applicant respectfully submits that the once-amended Claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested in Kolster. In fact, Kolster

has taught away from the features recited in Claim 1 by attaching a separate scanner device to a computing device. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the once-amended Claim 1 shall be allowable over Kolster. The reconsideration of claim 1-7 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is also amended to include similar features recited in Claim 1. The Applicant wishes to apply the above reasons/arguments to support the once-amended Claim 9. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the once-amended Claim 9 shall be allowable over Kolster. The reconsideration of claim 9-15 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that Claims 1-7 and 9-15 shall be in condition for allowance over the cited references. Early and favorable action is being respectfully solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplementary Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (408)777-8873.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, DC 20231", on April 28, 2004.

Faxed to (703)308-5248

Name: Joe Zheng

Signature: 

Respectfully submitted;



Joe Zheng
Reg.: 39,450